

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/917,392	07/27/2001	Kevin J. Conner	H0001551.	9953

128 7590 10/18/2004

HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.
101 COLUMBIA ROAD
P O BOX 2245
MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245

EXAMINER

HARRISON, CHANTE E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2672

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/917,392

Applicant(s)

CONNER, KEVIN J.

Examiner

Chante Harrison

Art Unit

2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 June 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Request for Reconsideration, filed on 10/20/03. ***This action is made FINAL.***
2. Claims 1-12 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 4-7 and 10 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chris Malachowsky et al. U.S. Patent 5,117,485, 5/1992.

As per independent claim 1, Malachowsky discloses determining one or more trapezoids for defining the available display area based on the parameters of the one or more unusable display areas (i.e. generating trapezoids without processing portions outside a clip window) (col. 2-3, ll. 66-10); generating an image (i.e. generating a visible portion of a figure/image) (col. 10-14); determining location of components of the generated image relative to the determined one or more trapezoids (i.e.

Art Unit: 2672

decomposing the figure/image by sorting the start and stop points of each scan line that defines the trapezoid) (col. 3, ll. 19-32); and rendering the components of the generated image that are determined to be located within the one or more trapezoids (col. 3, ll. 23-26).

As per dependent claims 2, 8 and 11, Malachowsky discloses a) generating lines that define a boundary around the available display area (i.e. defining a clip window) (col. 4-5, ll. 66-3); b) eliminating all lines being parallel to a predefined scan line direction (i.e. eliminating lines which subtend the shape and need not be processed since they are outside a clip window) (col. 2-3, ll. 66-10); c) setting a first flag for each line to the lines maximum coordinate in a first axial direction, the first axial direction being orthogonal to the scan line direction (i.e. setting the x or y coordinate extents of the line) (col. 5, ll. 20-25); d) sorting the remaining lines into a list according to a sorting scheme (col. 7, ll. 31-40); e) generating a trapezoid based on the first two lines in the list and the next highest flag value of all the flags (col. 6, ll. 10-20); f) replacing the flag of the first and second lines with the next highest flag (col. 8, ll. 60-68); g) if the first flag for the first or second line is equal to the minimum coordinate of the respective line on the axis orthogonal to the scan line direction, eliminating that line (col. 8, ll. 10-20); and h) repeating d-g until all lines are eliminated (i.e. repeating the process to identify all pixels/scan lines within the clip window that are to be stored/transferred for display) (col. 9, ll. 3-5).

Art Unit: 2672

As per dependent claims 3, 9 and 12, Malachowsky discloses setting a second flag for each line to a coordinate associated with the first flag in a second axial direction, the second axial direction being orthogonal to the first axial direction (i.e. setting the x or y coordinate extents of the line, wherein the x or y axis are orthogonal to the one another) (col. 5, ll. 20-25); wherein the sorting scheme places lines with the highest first flag value first in the list (col. 7, ll. 31-40); and if lines have the same first flag value, place the line with the lower second flag value first in the list. (col. 8, ll. 51-55)

As per independent claim 4, Malachowsky discloses a computer program product (col. 4, ll. 35-45) for performing the method of claim 1. Therefore the rationale applied in the rejection of claim 1 applies herein.

As per independent claim 5, Malachowsky discloses a computer program product (col. 4, ll. 35-45) for performing the method of claim 2. Therefore the rationale applied in the rejection of claim 2 applies herein.

As per independent claim 6, Malachowsky discloses a computer program product (col. 4, ll. 35-45) for performing the method of claim 3. Therefore the rationale applied in the rejection of claim 3 applies herein.

Art Unit: 2672

As per independent claim 7, Malachowsky discloses a means (Fig. 3) for implementing the method of claim 1. Therefore the rationale applied in the rejection of claim 1 applies herein.

As per independent claim 10, Malachowsky discloses a system having a computer program product (Fig. 3; col. 4, ll. 35-45) for implementing the method of claim 1. therefore the rationale applied in the rejection of claim 1 applies herein.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 6/28/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to claims 1, 7, and 10, Applicant argues Malachowsky fails to teach or suggest determining one or more trapezoids for defining the available display area and rendering the components of the generated images that are determined to be located with the one or more trapezoids.

In reply, Malachowsky teaches displaying an image in a multiple window environment, where each window may overlap other windows (col. 4-5, ll. 62-2). Malachowsky discloses the image data is divided into quadrilateral subportions that represent trapezoidal portions (col. 6, ll. 25-35). The trapezoidal portions are displayed in a window, e.g. clip window, by comparison of image data, e.g. vertices, defining trapezoid portions to coordinate data of the clip window (col. 5-6, ll. 60-6), which suggests trapezoids that define the display area are determined. Malachowsky further discloses the clip window defines the usable display area; and is based on other windows that may overlap it (col. 4-5, ll. 62-2), which suggests that the defined display area is based on the unusable display areas occupied by other windows having differing image data. Malachowsky discloses scanning the trapezoidal portions to a frame buffer for presentation on the output display (col. 6, ll. 35-38).

Based on the above rationale the rejection of claims 1, 7 and 10 is maintained. Accordingly, dependent claims 2-6, 8, 9, 11 and 12 are not allowable based on the above rejection.

2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2672

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chante Harrison whose telephone number is 703-305-3937. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Razavi can be reached on 703-305-4713. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ceh

Chante Harrison
Examiner
Art Unit 2672



MICHAEL RAZAVI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600